



TITLE:

# COMPETITION FOR SURVIVAL AMONG INHABITANTS AND FULLY DEVELOPED HUMAN BEINGS

AUTHOR(S):

Ikegami, Jun

---

CITATION:

Ikegami, Jun. COMPETITION FOR SURVIVAL AMONG INHABITANTS AND FULLY DEVELOPED HUMAN BEINGS. Kyoto University Economic Review 1976, 46(1-2): 19-34

ISSUE DATE:

1976-10

URL:

<https://doi.org/10.11179/ker1926.46.19>

RIGHT:

# THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS  
IN THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

---

VOL. XLVI, NO. 1-2

APRIL-OCTOBER 1976

Whole No. 100-101

---

## CONTENTS

**Modern Revolution and Ideology**

*Yoshiharu OZAKI* 1

**Competition for Survival among Inhabitants  
and Fully Developed Human Beings**

*Jun IKEGAMI* 19

**Economic Analysis of Business Organizations**

*Banri ASANUMA* 35

---

PUBLISHED BY

THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY

SAKYO-KU, KYOTO, JAPAN

# COMPETITION FOR SURVIVAL AMONG INHABITANTS AND FULLY DEVELOPED HUMAN BEINGS

*By* Jun IKEGAMI\*

“Studies on the Theory of Civil Society” is one of the domains of research for today’s economics. In Japan, the subject was originally studied in relation to the ideological features of Japanese capitalism. It represented the struggle against semi-feudalistic land ownership, deep-rooted in Japanese society, and the demand for democratic change to agrarian reform.

The agrarian reform demolished the system of old landownership in Japanese country, one of the main pillars of prewar Japanese capitalism, and largely contributed to modernisation of Japanese society. At the same time, the voice of democracy took the new form, and the “new democracy” or anti-trust policy and demand for self-determination of peoples have become the main stream of postwar ideology. However, the Japanese capitalism continues to depend on cheap labour, and social control over working and wage conditions has been rather inadequate. Consequently, those “traditional” relationships such as subcontracting, seniority system, etc. still subsist in Japan. On the other hand, large scale development on regional level aggravated both urban and rural problems, while environmental issues and disasters continued to gain their seriousness and scale. The movement for regional democracy, connecting urban and agricultural populations, is an outcome of such situation; of particular importance is the call for democracy of municipalities and communes. As it is, the postwar Japanese democracy had to face not only the tasks of anti-trust policy and demand for self-determination of peoples, but also the fight with feudalistic heritages and democratic reform of municipalities, including economic aspects of educational autonomy and self-government by inhabitants. Economists, under these circumstances, tried to identify the basis of democracy in the relationships of labour and ownership—particularly that of small-scale producers—following the path of classical economics, and destruction of these relationships under capitalism and their reconstitution under socialism. They also tried to study democratic reforms through “reconstruction” of local communities and establishment of the “civil minimum” concept. Regrettably, however, all these efforts reached sooner or later a formidable deadlock, a problem which could not be resolved by the concept of private ownership or community. This is because any discussion on democracy is incomplete unless institutions and form of the democracy are studied in conjunction with scientific analysis of people’s governorability, as people themselves are responsible for autonomy. Anti-trust policy, self-determination of people, construction of socialism,

---

\* Associate Professor.

or establishment of municipality all require this perspective to be closely studied.

Propositions and ideas on democracy by those economists may well be valid and appropriate, but unless they are substantiated by actual capability of the majority of people, democracy remains meaningless, and civil society studies are good only to highlight the unsurmountable gap between the ideals and the reality.

In postwar Japan, it was those pedagogists and civil administrators who considered the democracy in terms of fully developed human beings. Economists in general paid little attention to theorize on the matter of human development. This was probably because the economists were under the methodological tradition in which law of economics and parties in production were separate and human factors were reduced to sentiments in order to restore the problem of subjecthood to the mere issues of consciousness.

Economics, however, consistently pursued since its foundation the relationships between the economic principles and human development who were the fearers of democracy. As it is, to bring the "studies on the theory of civil society" back on the proper course will be a meaningful attempt, because it releases democratic theories from the messianic call of conscious elites and places them on the sound foundation under the perspective of total capability of inhabitants for self-government. The present thesis is in fact an introduction to such an attempt. It presents the writer's conclusion of various studies he has done in the domain of public finance, and his essay on the Japanese civil society after the Second World War, characterized by an expansion in the number of workers and their advance as the bearer of post-war Japanese democracy.

## I Competition and Development in Economics

When economics started analysis of capitalist society as "civil society", the first reality which came into view was the "struggle by all against all", and various aspects of the struggle on which individuals' survival depended. As Hobbs pointed out, the thinkers in the middle of 17th century assumed that if nature created men with equal mental and physical capability, it would generate "equality of capability leading to equality of hope for our achievement of purpose" and, for that reason, "if two people want the same thing but it is impossible for them to enjoy in common, they will become enemies, and will strive hard to destroy or capitulate each other in the course of achievement of their goals (mainly their own conservation, sometimes their delectation)"<sup>1)</sup>. Under these circumstances, the struggle for individual conservation or delectation, if it is left as it is, will develop into a real warfare, and since "the fruit of work" is uncertain, there will be no incentive for work. Land will remain uncultivated, without tools, knowledge, technique, alphabet, nor culture. "There is a continuous terror, and the danger of life by violence, and man's life is lonely, poor, perilous, cruel and short"<sup>2)</sup>.

It is only natural to think that such a horrible condition can be stopped only by abandoning a part of the right to fight with each other, accepting the rule of state and

1) Thomas Hobbs, *Leviathan*, 1651. (Tr. H. Mizuta, Iwanami Shoten, 1954, pp. 200-201).

2) *Ibid.*, pp. 203-204.

ensuring the fruit of toil. Economists of the 18th century therefore stressed that the development of division of labour and production in a society governed by positive law and free competition are essential in order to guarantee progress of mankind. Mandeville who published "Fables of Bees" in 1729, and Adam Smith who published "the Wealth of Nations" in 1776, both represent such a point of view<sup>3)</sup>. Smith, nevertheless, was obliged to point out a contradiction in that even the positive law succeeded to establish orders for free competition, independence of livelihood based on freedom of business and the resultant development of independence of men tend to deprive men of their autonomy at the same time as division of labour would not permit them to achieve fully developed human beings. Smith stated that "nothing corrupts men as much as does subordination, while on the contrary independence promotes men's honesty. For this reason, establishment of commerce and industry, by promoting the independence, serve as the best police force to prevent crimes"<sup>4)</sup>. However, he also stated that development of social division of labour and understanding limited to the scope of routine work destroy the opportunity to display inventiveness, and workers are deprived of courage and health due to the monotonous stagnance of daily life, to such an extent that "it is impossible for him to use his best efforts, courage and perseverance except for the occupation for which he was trained"<sup>5)</sup>. In the former statement, capitalism and freedom of occupation were considered to encourage man's independence and, in consequence, his development, and progress of division of labour and expansion of exchange, i.e., expansion of the freedom of doing business, was a positive factor to promote human development in terms of independence. However, in the second statement, the same division of labour, which he assumed to increase productivity through concentration of human capability to a part, and thus expanding exchange, tend to simplify labour and becomes an obstacle to fully developed human beings. In either case, the power of state increases in order to protect private property, and even if the rule by law is enforced, competition for survival does not disappear; it continues to exist in the quest for economic independence and preventing true development of human beings. The trend becomes more pronounced as men attach themselves more to one division of labour and one kind of occupation in order to safeguard their own survival.

If this is the reality, then the warfare for preservation and delectation which Hobbs thought to exist at the natural state does not end by establishment of state's power, private property, and protection of the fruit of work. In the realm of economy, they serve to intensify the state of warfare. Development of division of labour, particularly, while enhancing independence of man, weakness at the same time individual independence. It offers opportunity for human development, but it forms at the same time an obstacle for such development. Statutory guarantee by the state of private ownership, while acting as an intermediary to enhance development of individuals, prepares continuation

3) A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, The Modern Library, N.Y., p. 3.

4) A. Smith, *Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue and Arms, delivered in the Univ. of Glasgow*, (Translated by Y. Takashima and H. Mizuta, *Lectures at Glasgow University*, Nippon Hyoronsha, 1947. p. 315.

5) A. Smith, *Inquiry*, pp. 734-735.

of competition for survival and pleasure by eroding the same independence.

It was Malthus who gave a theoretical expression to the new form of competition by his "principles of population" which can be summarized, according to the words used by Engels towards 1840, as follows:

"Just as in the case of any other commodity, if there are too few labourers on hand, price, i.e., wages rise, the workers are more prosperous marriages multiply, more children are born and more live to grow up until a sufficient number of labourers has been secured. If there is too many on hand, prices fall, want of work, poverty, and starvation and consequent diseases arise, and "surplus population", is put out of the way. And Malthus, who carried the foregoing proposition of Adam Smith farther, was also right, in his way, in asserting that there is always a surplus population; that there are always too many people in the world; he is wrong only when he asserts that there are too many people on hand than can be maintained from the available means of subsistence, Surplus population is engendered rather by the competition of the workers among themselves, which forces each separate worker to labour as much as each day as his strength an possibly admit"<sup>6)</sup>.

The preceding account illustrates how economics treated the question of competition for survival among inhabitants under the capitalism. One thing clearly shown here is the fact that a question has continuously been asked: would competition for survival among inhabitants encourage or prevent to perform fully developed human beings? The problem of human development of inhabitants has been repeatedly examined in terms of competition. Hobbs, Mandeville, Smith and Malthus to certain extent questioned the relationship between human development and economics or the state. Nevertheless, modern economics—particularly in Japan—largely neglected the issue. The author once treated the problem as a part of his research into the public finance in capitalism (study of poverty)<sup>7)</sup>. In this thesis, the author tries to look into the relationships between competition for survival among inhabitants and poverty, and those between the poverty and fully developed human beings on the basis of Marxism. Readers will notice that such concepts as "working days", "cooperatives", "manufacture", "machinery and large-scale industry" and "primitive accumulation", which were ignored in the economics, play important roles in the present thesis.

## **II Loss of Inhabitants' Governorbility and Concentration of it to Capitalistic State**

Hobbs' theory of restriction of universal competition in which inhabitants and the state enter into a contract whereby the former, in return for the right to fight with each other, obtain the state's guarantee or protection of their fruits of work, actually means a kind of social division of labour in that rule is assigned to a special class as the rulers and the rest accept their rule. Engels would say that formation of a class which monopolizes

6) F. Engels, *Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England*, 1845, *MEW*, Bd. 2, S. 311.

7) J. Ikegami, *Modern Capitalism and Public Finance*, Yuhikaku, 1974, see the last chapter.

the common task of protecting private property in a society can be identified with concentration of power and loss of govern ability of inhabitants and this will convert the common business of a society into something which is alienated from the society, something which comes out of the society and reigns over it.

The process in which the rule becomes an exclusive occupation of a special class in a society and the rest of people are deprived of their capability to such an extent that it becomes a kind of social division of labour, was considered as an inevitable process which accompanies development of social division by labour and development of productivity in a society. Hobbs justifies as a natural law the contract between the ruler and the ruled in that such a division of labour is indispensable to ensure growth of production, human development and protection of the fruit of their work<sup>8)</sup>. Such a contract will naturally mean abandonment of the rights of ruled people, and concentration of such rights to the ruler. According to Hobbs, "If others are doing the same, man should willingly abandon his rights to anything to the extent that he thinks it necessary for the sake of peace and self-defence, and he should be content to possess such freedom with regard to others as he will tolerate others will possess with regard to him"<sup>9)</sup>.

If it is so, then the rights still left with the inhabitants will be limited to only those to resist danger to life, injury and imprisonment, and those which are essential to safeguard personality, but human development is assured at the same time. When people who are equal and fighting with each other decide to conclude the contract in order to develop their capability and productivity, the power will be monopolized by certain number of men and the majority can be praised of their capacity of government only by abandonment of their rights.

To Adam Smith, the division of labour between the ruler and the ruled is identified, in so far as the joint work of social protection to maintain fruit of individuals' labour is concerned, with the process of forming of regular army by the state which dissolves the system of militia, a system in existence for a long time among inhabitants, or the right of inhabitants to defend themselves<sup>10)</sup>, the shift to regular army means a progress of society in the sense that it improves effectiveness of defence and the results of division of work can be related to prosperity of the society. At the same time, it also means that certain people now have the right to choose peace or war, that these people are now free from participation of inhabitants to administration and deliberation.

Smith wrote: "The decision concerning peace or war was left to all people in the beginning. However, as social progress took place, towns were fortified, ordnance stores were replenished, money was saved and collected, and generals and officers were appointed, it was no longer possible for everybody to participate to the deliberation. The task, therefore, was either assigned to a court of justice, or to those people specifically appointed for that purpose"<sup>11)</sup>. As the result of such division of labour, the division of labour to produce material wealth made great progress, but as we have seen in the

8) Hobbs, *ibid.*, pp. 206-207, "The reason suggests convenient terms and conditions of peace and men are led to agree with those."

9) *Ibid.*, p. 210.

10) J. Ikegami, *ibid.*, p. 63 and p. 299.

11) A. Smith, *Lectures*, *ibid.*, p. 114.

preceding section, social constituents no longer had any knowledge except those directly concerning their own trades, and they lost interest in defence and development of the society. The paradox that people rule by abandoning their right to rule, under these circumstances, no longer holds true. Their governorability is lost and the society would face the danger of disintegration, if there were no counter-actions such as national education. Smith clearly went one step farther than Hobbs, as he saw that the division of work among those who rule and those who are ruled was not only a result of progress of social productivity, but such progress could only be achieved at the sacrifice of fully developed human beings and by promoting one-sided development among themselves. The inhabitants are deprived of governorability in double sense as they no longer have any access to government while being alienated from the opportunity of achieving fully developed human beings.

As the development of economic theories after A. Smith clearly indicates, development of capitalism increases social productivity by realizing one-sided development of human capability by structurizing and solidifying social division of labour under the hegemony of manufacture. In the process of primitive accumulation of capital and of development of machinery and large-scale industry, productivity is further developed by separating inhabitants from their means of production and livelihood—particularly from land and means of labour—and by demanding mobility and adaptability of the inhabitants' capability.

The fact shows an aspect in which, for instance, division of labour is systematically pursued by machinery, and another aspect in that the use of machinery opens up the use of female and juvenile labour which intensifies competition with adult workers, and that the inhabitants—be it in cities or in countries—are forced constantly to adapt themselves to movement and liquidity, to the new environment of factories and community. Thus, the inhabitants are not only alienated from government by systematic division of labour and deprived of their governorability; they are forced to face competition for survival while moving from one location to another, to such an extent that they are deprived of everything except for those actions necessary for their survival, and also of the opportunity and capability to participate in government.

Darwin pointed out, in his "Origin of the Species", that natural selection comes to a stage where individual minor variations are no longer allowed to occur in development of natural organs of animals and plants, as "a tool for one specific purpose must take different forms to suit different purposes"<sup>12)</sup>. Tools for manufacture and their development corresponding to one-sided development of human capability give expression to the progress of productivity, but on the other hand, development of productivity on larger scale further promotes one-sided development of human capability by large-scale industry and machinery, thus producing machinery for more accurate as well as finite production process and this intensifies competition for survival of individuals. Engels stated "quality of natural or artificial conditions of production determine survival or

12) Darwin, *Origin of Species*, translated by Uchiyama and Yamada, Ed. Sogensha, Vol. 1, p. 208.



death of individual capitalists, of industry, of states. Those who lose are mercilessly removed. Darwin's survival of individuals is transplanted from the nature to the society, with violence increased by several times"<sup>13</sup>).

When the competition for survival is taking place, Hobbs' "Contract" or Smith's "Agreement" of inhabitants for the sake of so-called "division of labour" never materializes in such pastoral forms, but there were forced deprivation of inhabitants' governorability in the form of so-called primitive accumulation, as was strongly pointed out by the author of "Das Kapital". The division of work between the ruler and the ruled is based, in the case of feudalistic society, on the division of labour between the land owners and those who are small and widely scattered cultivators. Development of independent farmers served to enlarge their conscientiousness and aroused interest in production of goods and social division of labour, and consequently, the interest in human rights for the sake of freedom of business. However, the embryo of governorability was not strong enough to force princes to accept the "contract". Under the power of large landowners who were anxious to participate in the new opportunities of enriching themselves—such as wool spinning industry—the people were separated from their land, means of production and livelihood. They were wiped out and thrown out around the industry and tenement as proletariat. The embryos of governorability, which once appeared as a promise for future development, subsequently undergoes systematic modification through forced extension of working time and "blood enactment" into something worthy of "being governed". Their ability of self-government is thoroughly eliminated, while at the other end of the spectrum, a new class of the rich is formed; they lend money to the state by virtue of the authority of possession and have access to public funds, and are able to make new investment in growing industry. They form a new social class who supplements the system of public debts by means of public taxation and legal sanction of the unchallenged sanctity of private ownership of wealth.

However, the laws which endorse forced extension of working hour can, at the same time, serve as motives for those who claim reduction of working hours in the name of freedom, as those institutions apparently in support of freedom—such as business, private ownership and choice of occupation—come into existence. According to the author of "Das Kapital", the laws which forced increase of number of working days from the middle of 14th to the end of 17th century not only "produces thus, with the extension of the working day,..... the deterioration of human labour-power by robbing it of its mornal, moral and physical, conditions of development and function", but "produces the premature exhaustion and death of the labour-power itself"<sup>14</sup>). Notwithstanding the increase of the sum of the expenses for the reproduction of labour-power, or increase in loss of the capital, competition between capital forces such loss and produces "unlimited excess" and finally, "social enforcement of control". The control to restrict such loss of

13) F. Engels, *Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science*, translated by T. Terasawa, Otsuki Shoten, Kokumin Bunko, p. 97.

14) K. Marx, *Das Kapital*. I. MEW. Bd. 23, S. 281.

human labour-power starts when machines are introduced and the theoretically equal contractual relationship between workers and capitalist is destroyed, when the workers as the heads of family are forced to sell their wives and children as slaves to the capital and life of family is disorganized and the labour for production of life is dispelled from family, to such an extent that the society and its institutions find it necessary, as a part of rule, to intervene in reproduction of life.

Marx says: "The revolution effected by machinery in the juridical relationship between the seller and buyer of labour-power, and causing the transactions as a whole to lost even the appearance of contracts between free persons, afforded the British Parliament an excuse, founded on juridical principles, for the interference of the state with factories." "Nowadays, the capital buys children and young persons under age"<sup>15)</sup>.

The suppression on human development of inhabitants starts from alienating them from governorbility. Development of the freedom of business and system of factory to their very limit, however, at last deprived families of reproduction of inhabitants' life and expanded scope of government until it was necessary to control it as a social measures. If slave traffic is not a part of the freedom of doing business, the capital must accept certain control of society on the limitation of working hours and education of children and young persons under age. However, if the right to determine length and duration of labour is a part of the capital's freedom of doing business, the fact that a new administrator called factory inspector controls excess of capital must be considered the society's control over the freedom of doing business.

Juridical recognition of the right to reproduce and develop the life could be said that the inhabitants at last got a hold in order to realize fully developed human beings including the governorbility, and that those who monopolized governorbility has given the inhabitants some kind of social guarantee to develop governorbility by the very act of systematic plunder of inhabitants' governorbility. At the same time, the début of factory inspectors now suggests the possibility of a new type of official work, which aims to promote the right of inhabitants to develop themselves, to enter a new relationship of division of labour and cooperation. It is now clear that the full development of competition for survival, through the changes in the labour and family system, opened up a new prospect for inhabitants' participation to the government and for their fully developed human beings. Although the embryo of governorbility of small-scale producers was lost, a new embryo of the same capability governorbility now appears among the working family, supported by the official work. The new prospect would be guaranteed of more systematic development as the British labour movement enter the scene, demanding the universal suffrage, standard working day and development of educational clauses.

As Marx said, "in place of the pompours catalogue of 'the inalien rights of mans', comes the modest Magna Charta of legally limited working day, which shall make clear 'when the time which the workers sells is ended, and when his own begins', quantum mutatus ab illo!"<sup>16)</sup>

15) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, SS. 418-419.

16) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, S. 320.

The distinction between working hours (worker's master's time) and the worker's own time for his living, and the human rights which occurs as a consequence, are no longer based on the might of possession, they are built on the right of socially-guaranteed human development. It is now clear that the bases of a new and modern democracy are established.

Workers are now the master of their own time and the Factory Act has introduced a process of recovery and development of inhabitants' development, to such an extent that the law "gives a certain moral energy which is directing them to the eventual possession of political power"<sup>17)</sup>. Now, all the means strengthening monopoly of governorbility are now transforming themselves into something opposite—i.e., into the force to destroy the monopoly. Citizens are no longer those who are small-scale producers or petitbourgeois, but a new type of citizens who are assured of development by the society and who are in a constant contact with the official work.

### **III The Influence of "Division of Labour and Labour Mobility" in Large-Scale Industry over the Fully Developed Human Beings**

If the distinction between working hours and worker's own time for his living is considered as the first step of recovery of inhabitants' governorbility, the material base of liberating men from "one-sidedness of working capability" originating from systematic division of labour and from the resultant "alienation from development of governorbility" and leading them to development of fully developed human beings and governorbility will be given by large-scale industry.

It is one of the greatest achievements of "Das Kapital" that it pointed out very clearly and for the first time a fact that the contradicting two trends of the maximum "detail labourers" of work capability and the "mobility" of workers under mechanized large-scale industry must be reflected upon the conditions and movement of the working class, two subordinate variables of accumulation of capital, and that the contradiction offers a chance for fully developed human beings.

While cooperation and division of labour in capitalistic society and its large-scale mechanized industry produce detail labourers as well as control and synthesis and monopoly of all mental functions by the capitalists (or those who have authority delegated by the capitalists), "in order to make the collective labourer, and through him capital, rich in social productive power, each labourer must be made poor in individual productive powers"<sup>18)</sup>. In other words, "what is lost by the detail labourers, is concentrated in the capital that employs him. It is a result of the division of labour in manufactures, that the labourer is brought face to face with the material production process the intellectual potencies of material process of production, as the property of another, and as a ruling power. This separation begins in simple cooperation in which the capitalist represent to the single workman, the openness and the associated labour. It is developed in manufacture which cuts down the labourer into a detail labourer. It is completed

17) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, S. 320.

18) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, S. 382.

in modern industry, which makes science a productive force distinct from labour and presses it into the service of capital"<sup>19</sup>).

In this process of shift from simple cooperation to manufacture, work and life of so-called independent small-scale producers, their richness in developing personality, their small-scale but fully developed humanity are now disassembled in the division of work and cooperation<sup>20</sup>), and capability of individual workers loses independence. It can display high productivity only in the capitalists' factory, but individual independence is drastically reduced. The labour's dependence on the factory of capitalists means dependence of life on employment opportunities, and more intense competition for survival among inhabitants, directed at opportunities for obtaining employment. Capability of individuals is fixed in detailed labour and achievement of fully developed human being is prevented. In the limited technological base of manufacture, it was difficult to adapt workers completely to the needs of capital, because production still depended largely on individual skill. Introduction of machinery, however, reduces step by step the need for capitalistic production to depend on individual skills and capability. In one hand it pushes forward the principle of division of labour and cooperation by conscious application of science, thus making workers more and more subordinated to detailed labour, while on the other hand, it produces incessant adaptation, interchangeability and mobility of workers before the needs of the capital.

In other words, machinery and large-scale industry pursue systematically division of labour and transformation of workers into detailed units through conscious application of science, while on the other hand, "in the machinery system, large-scale industry comes to possess a thoroughly objective organ of production, and workers find it before their eyes as an established and material condition of production"<sup>21</sup>). It suffices for the workers to adapt themselves to the productive organ, and so long as machinery does not require physical strength, members of working class family—women and children—also become workers, and they are now forced to sacrifice even their playing time, or the time for "free work for the family"<sup>22</sup>) in order to work for capitalists. In such an instance, adaptation to the needs of sectionalized labour, which is required by organic function of machinery, is no longer human as it was in manufacture. The needs for ready adaptation to other types of detailed labour is directed by the plant or factory manager, together with the need for "mobility" of capability. Even if a worker acquires such adaptability through education and training, it can be reduced at any time to uselessness once other type of capability comes into demand from "those independent organic body called machinery, and this reduces in turn the value of work in a direct way. Subordination of workers and their family to machinery produces intolerably severe competition for survival under the constant innovation of transportation system and anarchic competition

19) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, S. 382.

20) "Such knowledge wisdom and will which independent farmers and artisans can display if on a small scale are now necessary only for the entire workshop. At one side, those mental capabilities for production expand their scale, because they are lost at a number of places" K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, S. 382.

21) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, S. 407.

22) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, S. 416.

between the capital<sup>23)</sup>.

“The instrument of labour, when it takes the form of a machine, immediately becomes a competitor to the workman himself. The self-expansion of capital by means of machinery is thenceforward directly proportional to the number of workers, whose means of labour livelihood have been destroyed by the machinery,..... division of labour specializes this labour power, by reducing it to skill in handling a particular tool. Once the machinery can handle the tools, exchange value of labour disappears along with its use-value. Workers can no longer sell themselves just like the paper money thrown out of currency by legal enaitment’’<sup>24)</sup>.

It is now clear from the preceding quotation that Marx considers the true nature of large-scale industry on one side as the necessity leading to the “conversion of work, mobility of function, and total mobility of workers” and on the other hand, he proves that the industry produces a contradicting trend to “reproduce, in its capitalistic form, old division of labour with its structurized ramification”. This “absolute contradiction” can be regarded as the very reason that “all tranquility, continuity and security of workers’ livelihood are going to be lost”.

However, such a negative aspect of the large-scale industry could be turned into a positive thing once it is combined with the educational clauses of the Factory Act in order to serve as the first step of total development of men as an element of the inhabitants’ governing capability. Marx said: “the educational clauses in the Factory Act may seem rather limited in their effectiveness, but they nevertheless declared that elementary education was a prerequisite of labour. The results demonstrated the possibility to combine education and physical training, and consequently, to combine physical labour to education and physical training, for the first time in the history..... it is not only one of the means to increase social production output, but it is the only way to produce totally developed men’’<sup>25)</sup>.

Once there exists the opportunity for the right to learn while working, it now becomes possible to establish, as a social institution of education, the huge achievements of mechanized, large-scale industry in that: (1) it destroyed the “secret skill” enclosed in the medieval guild system and realized a social method of conscious application of modern technology and natural science, and (2) it demanded all individuals to acquire versatility to be engaged in all sorts of occupation, and it also prepared the way for “appearance of those individuals who are totally developed and who are capable to perform alternatively various social functions as their own form of activities, along with their dedication

23) J. Ikegami, *ibid.*, see the last chapter.

24) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, S. 454. Also refer to S. 510 “the principle of large-scale industry, i.e., the principle of disassembling each production process into its constituent elements as a mere process and without giving any consideration to human hands in the meantime has given rise to the ‘technology’, a thoroughly modern science”.

25) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, SS. 507–508. Also refer Kozo Yanagase, On theoretical Ground of the Cost of Public Education, University of Ehime, *Journal of Law Studies*, Dec. 1974, Vol. 1. No. 1.

to detailed labour. Those opportunities were the schools teaching scientific technology as social institutions and based on published materials, or those professional schools. The Factory Act produced, along with reduction in working hours, those educational clauses and created new possibility to convert the material base of total development of workers into a factor to develop their political capability. The competition for survival and impoverishment, again, prepared their positive counterpart at the same time.

#### **IV Necessity of Fully Developed Human Beings in Society and Labour in Public Sector**

The age when labour and reproduction of family are no longer "private affairs of factory owners and working families" but subject to socially established inter-dependence between labourers and labour in public sector (factory inspector), is also the age in which devaluation of the adult labour and division of value of labour among family members take place as the result of introduction of the machinery. Although consideration of so-called "citizens' society" presupposes invariably existence of "independent individuals" as the constituent elements. Actually, however, there is a significant difference between the "independence" based on private property and freedom of doing business and the "independence" based on the distinction between the working hours which is possible because of the property allowing control over unpaid labour of others and workers own time for his life, and the resultant social guarantee for development of individuals. The heart of such a distinction is the development of social character in the capitalistic production of wealth and reproduction of life, and the reality that there exists development of social division of labour between the labour in public sector to restrict the freedom of capitalistic business and the labour accomplished by inhabitants.

This is typically illustrated by the fact that the existence of labour in public sector called factory inspector is necessary in order to ensure distinction of working hours and worker's own time for his life as the prerequisite of the workers' right of developing their humanity, that educational labour (particularly teachers who are public servants) is necessary to ensure developing worker's humanity of working family by means of development of educational clauses of the Factory Act and obligatory education system, and that medical labour is necessary to implement public health and insurance. Development of labour in public sector (the state and community), and the reproduction of life of workers in which the labour in public sector serves as intermediary, are the conditions necessary to ensure fully developed human beings and their participation to government.

Historically, development and increase in number of public officer were the result of social classes, transformation of communal work into organ of social suppression, dispossession of inhabitants' opportunity to participate to government, to such an extent that administration could no longer be performed on the initiative of inhabitants, and forced control was exercised over inhabitants. As we have seen, increase in the number of labourer in public sector such as national defence and police bears witness to the

bureaucratic control. What is then the meaning of the appearance of factory inspector, a new breed of public officer, in the environment of the bureaucratic rule?

The capitalistic society is the one in which private ownership and production of commodities predominate. In the division of labour between the ruling and the ruled, the ruler leaves up to factory owners and capitalists survival of the ruled people, and capitalists can now produce surplus value on the basis of mutual competition for survival among the inhabitants. As Engels stated in his "Conditions of Working Class in England", the workers "have no property of their own at all and live without exception on wages which disappear from hand into mouth". Consequently, the society dissolved literally into the atom never gives a moment's thought on the workers. It lets workers to take care of themselves and their families, while it never gives them the means to do so effectively and continuously"<sup>26</sup>).

In such an instance, the division of work between the ruler and the ruled is accomplished, as Hobbs said, by concentrating the right of government, and by abandonment of the right by the ruled. It is sufficient to provide for the bureaucratic structures and means of violence to safeguard citizens' right of resistance and that of private ownership. Inhabitants' livelihood need not be "taken care of", it could be left as it is. However, the capitalistic society, because of the progress of large-scale industry, leads the life of inhabitants into something that "cannot be left as it is", that requires "the society to take care of". This is because the capitalism, while realizing the state of anarchy in the realm of economy, contains within itself certain elements necessitating restriction on the freedom of business and "competition". The important premises of social intervention in the economic life is the fact that the capitalists' factory robbed "free work" to reproduce family life by employing women and children. This occurred as "machines no longer needed muscle work" and "entire members of working family were organized under the direct control of capital without distinction of sex and age". The number of wage labourer grew very quickly, and "the forced work for capitalists not only replaced children's play, but it also replaced the free work which is done in the customary limits of family for its own sake"<sup>27</sup>).

The fact that value of labour drastically dropped for individual workers while it increased for a family means, from the standpoint of reproduction of family life, that the work needed to guarantee family's life and development was taken away by the capital and that if it were left untouched, reproduction of life in working family would no longer be possible, and that life would be wasted in a large way.

Therefore, in order to maintain reproduction of life in working family in the general environment of private ownership, production of merchandise and apparent equality of two parties in a contract, the society is now obligated to control excessive working hours, disregard for age of employee and business conducted on absence of distinction between worker's own time for his life and working hours, which used to be the part of

26) F. Engels, Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England, *MEW*, Bd. 2, S. 304.

27) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, S. 416.

freedom of doing business for the capital. Power of the state not only carries out such monopoly of governing capability for the interest of capitalists by means of bureaucracy and instruments of violence; the society produces, as one of the social division of labour such labour necessary to maintain life of the family, and let the factory inspectors, doctors and teachers for example share a part of the responsibility to reproduce the life of family, in lieu of the traditional free work within the family, as public labour. This has caused a serious issue as to whether those officials in charge of labour, education, medical cares and welfare should be incorporated within the bureaucracy, laissez-faire system and mechanism of violence, or if they should be utilized as a means of exercising democratic control over the bureaucracy along with inhabitants' right of self-government, universal suffrage and control over capital's freedom of doing business. The workers in public sector, as a part of the lower echelon of bureaucracy, try on one hand to subordinate labour, as a means of reproducing life, to the freedom of capital, thus allowing free play of laissez-faire and conversion into sectionalized labour, while on the other hand they try to maintain life of workers against the bureaucracy, and to reconstruct the free but customary labour, once carried out in the family in order to reproduce the labour, into a social, organized and systematic work backed up by scientific knowledges.

The first orientation is to bring the division of labour and machinery, two accomplishments of the factory system, into the organ of state. It aims to fix those workers in public sector as "detailed labourer" with one-sided field of vision, and who are opponents to inhabitants and try to impose the "labour in public sector", convertible progressively into laissez-faire for the sake of capital's free performance. However, this can often turn labour in public sector into unskilled labour and makes it necessary to recruit public officers from workers at large. Thus it produces a large number of public workers and professionals whose interests are identical to those of inhabitants, thereby promoting the second orientation in the long run.

Marx said in his "Instructions Concerning Specific Problems to the Representatives of Extraordinary Central Committee" as follows: "the most enlightened part of working class is perfectly conscious that the future of working class, i.e., future of mankind, depends totally upon its success in educating the working youth. They know that from such a viewpoint, children and youths must first of all be protected from the destructive action of modern organization of production. This can only be achieved by transforming social conscience into a social power, and in the present conditions, it can only be achieved through ordinary legislations which the state can enforce the compliance. Workers' demand for such legislation will never result in stronger power of the state. On the contrary, working class people can convert the power presently used against themselves into something which they could utilize for their own interests"<sup>28</sup>).

Another noteworthy problem in the advance of public labour, responsible for production of family's life, is the relationship between public work, both in the case of centralized power structure and in the case of local autonomy, its dissolution and its

28) Tokumitsu Yagawa ed., *Educational Thesis by Marx-Engels*, Aoki Shoten, 1956, p. 71.



relationship with the power of the state. It is well known that capitalism, through original accumulation of wealth, development of mercantile economy and advance of large-scale industry in regional and rural areas, causes destruction of traditional community and its function to reproduce life of local inhabitants, and that large-scale industry in consequence is now assigned with the reproductive functions. Deprivation of commonage in agricultural communities, land expropriation and process of conversion into industrial zone, dam, etc. in regional development, illustrate the fact that both in town and in country, dissolution of the inhabitants' traditional structure of government causes those which contribute to inhabitants' life to be assigned to capital through the intermediary of bureaucracy.

Marx pointed out that in rural districts of England, and also in her colonial system, dissolution of the community and their integration into the state also destroy the function of common work of the community (for example, prevention of flood), and that for this reason, frequency of flood increased in the English colonies.

As it is, large-scale industry is incapable not only of producing family life, but it can no longer allow traditional and spontaneous form of natural and human metabolism in local communities<sup>29)</sup>, and creates vast numbers of social problems in urban and rural areas alike.

As machinery becomes the common ground for both of industry and agriculture, small producers (agricultural) and owners of medium to small business are all involved in the problem of surplus population. Like workers, they are no longer able to depend on their family or agricultural community in bringing up education, medical cares and welfare; they become the object of administration by the state and community on the same basis as in urban areas. Democracy based on small-scale ownership of property becomes weak. Where there still exists certain relationship with urban community and the roles of family and local community, those traditional family relationship and division of property tend to become democratized, and there occurs a new form of democracy on the basis of modern cooperatives, and finally, "independent individuals".

In comparison with the total development of workers, development of farmers and small producers will appear as continuous rapport and combination of knowledge, wisdom and experience of small independent producers and those modern institutions materialized by culture, education and transportation<sup>30)</sup>.

Consequently, along with universal suffrage, reduction in working hours, educational and insurance clauses, there will be a demand for the local autonomy, autonomy of education, prevention of disaster, urban and rural policies, and the time will come when capability of self-government should be enhanced and expanded not only for workers but for all inhabitants. The local public employees will control freedom of capital in their own community in cooperation with the public workers of the state in order to

29) K. Marx, *a. a. O.*, S. 528.

30) Yasuhiko Shima, *General Principle of Public Finance*, Iwanami Shoten, 1963, refer to the chapter on local public finance.

ensure fully developed human beings.

Naturally, bureaucracy will try to extend its power to those very remote parts of districts by opposing the work for accomplishment of autonomy against the inhabitants in the hope of leading them in the realm of "freedom of business" and "laissez-faire".

There is little need to say that development of inter-relationship between development of democratic legislation on centralized power and autonomy of local community could take place on such opposing relationship. The opportunity for fully developed human beings which is offered by the large-scale industry can acquire more practical and systematic means within the new division of labour between workers in public sector and inhabitants.

## V Conclusion

The division of labour between the ruler and the ruled is getting increasingly difficult to be fixed because those responsible for production of life of family and local districts were disassembled by large-scale industry and bureaucracy, and reproduction of inhabitants' life had to be "reconstructed" as an object of administration by the state.

Progress of the society intensifies competition for survival to its limit and transform the trend of society from "competition for survival" to "competition for fully developed human beings" with the opportunities for total development, participation to government, and for the systematic development of governability in conjunction with the division of labour with official or public labour.

If we take such a perspective, then the concept of citizenship, as it was discussed in conventional economics and social studies, clearly needs review. Obviously, if those social studies fail to demonstrate those points as division of labour between the ruler and the ruled, and the necessity of fully developed human beings as the basis of overcoming such division, they must be qualified as untenable.

The "image of citizen" treated in the previous Japanese economic studies, represented for the most part those "independent citizens by virtue of their work" who are isolated individuals without having the sense of belonging to community. However, if the basis of independence is not merely ownership of property but it is fully developed human beings, then it is up to economics and politics to demonstrate that individuals should have knowledge, wisdom and judgement as small scale producers, and that even if those are denied, they could still develop totally, but as individuals<sup>31)</sup>.

Thesis concerning citizenship and society without study to large-scale industry and state, or to development of inhabitants' governability, is clearly a mere abstraction, the one which leads to fixation of conventional image of citizenship which corresponds only to low level of productivity.

31) The comments of Mr. Yoshihiko Uchida, who combines thesis on citizens' society and importance of the Factory Act on economics, should be developed further in this sense. "To grasp a man as personification of economic category would mean that it is also the man himself who enhances the contradiction in the economic category itself—the character of two antagonists—and to go beyond" *The World of "Das Kapital"*, Iwanami Shoten, 1966.